

under such heading for fiscal year 1998, shall remain available until expended."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, what does the language mean, so that I can understand it?

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I would be happy to elaborate on the legislation. The amendment's purpose is as follows: Each year in our refugee resettlement programs, we have considerable costs associated with that. We appropriate moneys for those. In a typical year, we always have trouble at the end of the year with respect to remaining funds that need to be spent. If there is remaining money at the end of a year, it will be carried forward to use in the next fiscal year for those purposes.

Mr. BYRD. For those purposes again?

Mr. ABRAHAM. Refugee resettlement purposes.

Mr. BYRD. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3539) was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I believe that completes all of the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the managers of the bill desire a rollcall?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Yes. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) would vote "nay."

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 259 Leg.]

YEAS—90

Abraham	Feinstein	Lugar
Akaka	Ford	Mack
Allard	Frist	McCain
Ashcroft	Gorton	McConnell
Baucus	Graham	Mikulski
Bennett	Gramm	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Grams	Moynihan
Bond	Grassley	Murray
Boxer	Gregg	Nickles
Breaux	Hagel	Reed
Brownback	Harkin	Reid
Bryan	Hatch	Robb
Bumpers	Hollings	Roberts
Burns	Hutchinson	Rockefeller
Campbell	Hutchison	Roth
Chafee	Inhofe	Santorum
Cleland	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Coats	Johnson	Sessions
Cochran	Kempthorne	Shelby
Collins	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kerrey	Snowe
Craig	Kerry	Specter
D'Amato	Kohl	Stevens
Daschle	Kyl	Thomas
DeWine	Landrieu	Thompson
Dodd	Lautenberg	Thurmond
Dorgan	Leahy	Torricelli
Durbin	Levin	Warner
Enzi	Lieberman	Wellstone
Feingold	Lott	Wyden

NAYS—3

Byrd Faircloth Smith (NH)

NOT VOTING—7

Bingaman	Glenn	Murkowski
Coverdell	Helms	
Domenici	Inouye	

The bill (S. 2334), as amended, was passed.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas, Mr. BROWNBACK, is recognized.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent there now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE APPLICATION OF THE INDEPENDENT COUNSEL STATUTE TO THE CLINTON/GORE/DNC CAMPAIGN FINANCE SCANDAL

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the last several weeks leading up to the end of a Congress are always a pressure packed time and a challenging time for all Members of this body. This fall, of course, is no exception. Given the legislative challenges we face, I would prefer that the Judiciary Committee's and the Senate's efforts stay focused exclusively on completing remaining legislative and appropriations items. Unfortunately, the Attorney General of the United States, Janet Reno, has diverted our attention from those issues we would all prefer to be working on because of her continued refusal to do

what the law compels her: request the appointment of an independent counsel to conduct the investigation of the fundraising activities surrounding the 1996 reelection campaign. I thank my ranking member on the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator LEAHY, for being willing to meet with me and Attorney General Reno and others for almost 3 hours this morning and into the afternoon.

We met along with top officials and staff of the Justice Department, including Deputy Attorney General Holder, Criminal Division Director James Robinson, Former Task Force head Charles LaBella, FBI Task Force lead agent James DeSarno, Public Integrity head Lee Radek, along with House Judiciary Chairman HYDE, House Government Reform and Oversight Chairman BURTON, and Ranking Member WAXMAN, having invited the Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS as well who could not attend the meeting, regarding the campaign finance investigation and the application of the independent counsel statute to this widespread and dangerous scandal.

I had requested this meeting in late July after the existence of the so-called LaBella memorandum had come to light. In that memo, Mr. LaBella, her handpicked lead investigator with the most extensive knowledge of the facts of this scandal, concluded that the facts and law dictated that a broad independent counsel be appointed to investigate campaign finance abuses by the 1996 Clinton/Gore reelection campaign, the Clinton administration, and the Democratic National Committee. This memo came several months after a similar written conclusion made by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Louis Freeh.

Under federal law, the Attorney General must apply to the special division of the Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit for appointment of an independent counsel whenever, after completion of a preliminary investigation, she finds that a conflict of interest exists or when she finds specific and credible information that a high-ranking official included in a specific category of individuals within the executive branch may have violated federal law. The appointment of an independent counsel is a serious matter and one which the Attorney General should only initiate when necessary.

Yet, more than one and a half years ago, all ten Republicans on the Judiciary Committee felt the time had come to request such an appointment. We sent a letter to the Attorney General, as we are authorized to do by the independent counsel statute, requesting that she make an application for an independent counsel and demonstrating the evidence which requires such an application concerning the campaign finance scandal.

I must confess, as I did then, to a degree of frustration with the Independent Counsel Act. Did I appreciate having to send our letter? Certainly not.

Do I believe that changes need to be made to the Independent Counsel Act? Yes. Yet, the Independent Counsel Act is the law of the land and, notwithstanding its relative flaws, we on the Judiciary Committee and even a stubborn Attorney General have an obligation to abide by it. That issue was the primary focus of today's meeting.

In addition, the Department and my House colleagues asked me to broaden the focus of today's meeting to include a review of the LaBella memorandum. I agreed to this additional focus in order to work toward a reasonable resolution of the ongoing contempt dispute between Attorney General Reno and the House Committee on Governmental Reform and Oversight concerning the Attorney General's refusal to produce this document.

I had hoped that today's meeting might allay my concerns that the Attorney General is flouting both the independent counsel law and the Congress in its legitimate oversight function. Unfortunately, only some of my concerns were addressed satisfactorily.

On the contempt issue, I believe that Chairman BURTON generally concluded that today's review of the partially-redacted memoranda is a solid first step towards a reasonable resolution of the dispute. It is clear that we will need to have followup discussions with the Department as to some of the redactions, but it appears that the contempt crisis possibly may be averted. I congratulate Chairman BURTON, Ranking Member WAXMAN, Chairman HYDE, and the Attorney General for striving towards an accommodation, and I am pleased that our meeting had this positive outcome.

We are not yet there, and it is a decision that only the House can make. But I have to say I think we made a very important first step, hopefully the final step, and towards a positive outcome here.

I should point out, however, that approximately 60-70% of the LaBella memo was redacted on the alleged grounds that it discussed material protected under Rule 6(e), and nobody should conclude that the Attorney General has made a complete disclosure to the Congress.

However, on the larger and more significant issue of the appointment of an independent counsel, I cannot announce similar progress. After reviewing redacted versions of the memos prepared by Mr. LaBella and Director Freeh, it is clear that both gentlemen have advanced strong, convincing arguments in support of a broad-based independent counsel. Importantly, when I asked the Attorney General and her top advisors why those recommendations have, thus far, been rejected, the answers I received were vague, insufficient, or unconvincing.

I have urged Attorney General Reno to appoint a broad-based independent counsel for campaign finance for well over a year. In fact, these events have gone on for well over 2 years. I have written the Attorney General numer-

ous times to demonstrate how she is misapplying and misunderstanding the independent counsel law. The law allows her to appoint an independent counsel if she has information that a crime may—that is the pivotal word, “may”—have been committed, but she has read the law as requiring that the evidence shows without a doubt that a crime has been committed. This standard is way too high. By setting up these legal standards, she basically has required that a smoking gun walk in the doors of Justice Department before she will do anything.

I believe she is reexamining that issue. She has promised us to reexamine it. She has promised to look into this one final time, and I hope with all my heart she is doing so in good faith, and I will give her the benefit of the doubt that she is.

But, as has been widely reported, numerous individual investigations are being handled by the task force. We found out again today that is true. The LaBella memorandum talked in terms of literally dozens of independent investigations in which he was involved. Yet, the task force has reportedly never conducted an investigation or inquiry into the entire campaign finance matter in order to determine if there exists specific and credible information warranting the triggering of the independent counsel statute. Indeed, as has been reported, the task force has been utilizing a higher threshold of evidence when evaluating allegations that may implicate the Independent Counsel Act or White House personnel.

It has been argued that this different legal standard being applied to the campaign finance investigation has had the result of keeping the investigation of White House personnel out of the reach of the Independent Counsel Act. Today's briefing failed to respond to or put to rest any of these longstanding charges.

I have admired the courage of FBI Director Freeh and lead investigator LaBella in discussing, within applicable rules, their views on these important issues. They made it clear that the independent counsel is required under the law, that there are no legal arguments for the Attorney General to hide behind. Director Freeh stated that covered White House persons are at the heart of the investigation. Investigator LaBella said there was a core group of individuals at the White House and the Clinton campaign involved in illegal fundraising. That should be the end of the argument.

I was also struck by Mr. LaBella's comments that the public only knows one percent of what's out there. That scares me because I thought we have heard a lot about abuses by the DNC and how foreign money corrupted our system. His remark shows just how much we need an independent counsel.

Now some may attempt to defend the Attorney General by noting that she has initiated two 90-day reviews of potential perjury by the Vice-President

and former White House deputy chief of staff Harold Ickes. The political machine surrounding the Attorney General may have convinced her to take the two limited actions she has initiated to relieve the political heat. These two 90-day reviews completely avoid the substance of the real allegations. This is not to minimize the significance of perjury allegations, but her actions thus far miss the larger issues.

Any independent counsel must be given authority to delve into the most important questions surrounding or involving the scandal. As the New York Times concluded, a limited appointment would be a “scam to avoid getting at the more serious questions of whether the Clinton campaign bartered Presidential audiences or policy decisions for contributions. A narrowly focussed inquiry could miss the towering problem of how so much illegal foreign money, possibly including Chinese government contributions, got into Democratic accounts.” This is the New York Times.

We read today how FBI Director Freeh and Lead Investigator LaBella have recommended an appointment with a wide scope, and the Attorney General should not and cannot ignore their wise counsel any longer. As a unnamed senior government source told the Wall Street Journal: “We showed [the Attorney General] significant threads of evidence that went right into the White House and to the upper levels of the DNC.” Yet the Attorney General, thus far, has refused to act.

Moreover, the time for 30-day or 90-day reviews has passed: we need action. The campaign finance violations we are discussing happened 2 and 3 years ago. While the independent counsel statute allows for 30 and 90 day review periods, it does not require it. When the FBI Director and the lead investigator lay out the evidence showing that a broad independent counsel is necessary, the review periods are not warranted.

I must also take issue with the Attorney General's assertions that the current investigation is not a failure because it has secured a limited number of indictments. Let's remember that the ongoing campaign finance investigation has only indicted the most conspicuous people who made illegal donations to the DNC or the Clinton/Gore campaign. It has made no headway in finding out who in the administration or DNC knew about or solicited these illegal donations. Until it does so, the investigation is a failure, and in the eyes of many a sham.

Rather than make pronouncements concerning what the Congress should or must do in response to the Attorney General's continued misinterpretation of the law, I feel it is prudent to meet with those of my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee who joined with me in requesting that she apply for the appointment of an independent counsel more than a year ago.

I also want to pay particular tribute and respect to my ranking minority member, Senator LEAHY, who sat through all this today, has cooperated through all this, has tried to get to the bottom of this with us, and who may have a different view from me but nevertheless has worked in a bipartisan way to try to resolve these matters, a way that I intend to continue to work. And I don't think anybody can accuse me of not bending over backwards for the Attorney General through all these months and years.

In closing, let me quote the New York Times, which, I believe, captured the situation perfectly: "Ms. Reno keeps celebrating her stubbornness as if it were some sort of national asset or a constitutional principle that had legal standing. It is neither. It is a quirk of mind or personality that has blinded her to the clear meaning of the statute requiring attorneys general to recuse themselves when they are sunk to the axle in conflict of interest." That is strong language. I wish it had not had to be issued by the New York Times. But to many it seems to be accurate.

Strong will is a character trait I admire. Certainly I admire the Attorney General in many ways. But adherence to one's personal opinion at the expense of the law cannot be ignored, particularly when it is the Attorney General. Her refusal to appoint an independent counsel in accordance with the law should be of great concern to both Republicans and Democrats and to the American people for whom she is obligated and sworn to enforce the law. Notwithstanding the recent announcements, this matter has now passed the point of reasonableness, and I am no longer willing to give the Attorney General the benefit of the doubt: it is now beyond dispute that she is not living up to her duty to enforce the law.

I am hopeful that within a short period of time she will enforce the law, or I will have more to say on this matter. I have bent over backwards to try to be accommodating to her and accommodating to the Justice Department, but as we all know, it is now becoming an embarrassment to the Justice Department. There are a few down there who are backing her decisions and an awful lot of people including the Nation's top investigator, Louis Freeh, his chief investigator, James V. Desarno of the FBI, and the chief prosecutor and investigator, Charles LaBella, who have no axe to grind but all of whom have said it is time to get this behind us, to get an independent counsel, to stop any claims of conflict of interest, and to implement the law that is so clear on its face so that we can get to the bottom of these problems and do so in a way that does not involve the President's appointee investigating the very people who appointed her including the President.

I hope nobody has any legal problems in this matter, but it has to be resolved

in the eyes of the American people and certainly has to be resolved in the eyes of the Judiciary Committee or at least those who have requested that she request the appointment of an independent counsel, and it is time to get this behind us.

Again, I thank all of those who were in the meeting this morning—specifically, my colleague Senator LEAHY, my dear colleagues over in the House, Chairman HYDE who chairs the Judiciary Committee and has tremendous burdens on his shoulders right now, and also Congressmen BURTON and WAXMAN.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, first off, I thank my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Utah, for his kind remarks. We have tried to work very closely together on this. It is something that is not a happy chore for either one of us. The meeting we had today was nearly 3 hours, as I recall. He and I went off and had lunch afterward and discussed it. I think it accomplished a great deal. He and his counterpart in the House, Chairman HYDE, did a service for the Congress and for the country by patiently working out what I believe could have been a very difficult situation with the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee contempt resolution against the Attorney General. He has helped all people, Republicans and Democrats, and I commend the Senator from Utah for that.

The Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General and all the others who have been listed by the Senator from Utah, as I said, spent nearly 3 hours together today. The Attorney General explained, as she has in the past in public hearings, her reasons for not appointing an independent counsel to take over the ongoing Department investigation of allegations of wrongdoing in the 1996 Presidential election. She also provided us on a confidential basis internal Department memoranda in this matter.

Without going into what is in those memoranda, I mention the fact that she made them available for our review because it is unprecedented. And I, for one, appreciate the way the Attorney General has tried to keep Congress, in its oversight capacity, informed.

This is a serious matter. Whether or not the Attorney General should appoint an independent counsel has diverted the attention of a number of committees, both here in the Senate and the House, and a number of Members. It is a difficult thing because there are grand jury rules that have to be followed, there are secrecy rules that have to be followed, and there are internal procedures that have to be followed that sometimes may not allow for an instant response between the time a question is asked and the evening news.

The Attorney General has referred matters to independent counsels at least 10 times, if you count both the re-

quests she has made for appointments of new independent counsels or expansions of the jurisdictions of those independent counsels already operating. So she does not shy away from exercising her discretion under the independent counsel statute.

I do not want to see us get involved in some kind of intense second-guessing and arm-twisting of the Attorney General when she has shown she is willing to trigger an independent counsel statute, as she has done 10 times already. This goes for when she has declined to do so as well. So whether one agrees or disagrees with the Attorney General's decision on appointing independent counsels, or decisions not to appoint independent counsels—and one can agree or disagree—but what we as Senators want to be careful about, what we must be careful about, is not to politicize what is already becoming an overly politicized process. The meeting this morning was designed to bring down the decibel level. I do not want to be in a position to increase it.

I give the Attorney General credit for playing it straight with Members of Congress in both parties; for always being available and willing to explain her reasons to the extent she can without jeopardizing ongoing investigations or violating grand jury secrecy rules.

I have been here with five administrations and dealt with Attorneys General through all of them. There are some things that they cannot share with us and have to wait on, either because of grand jury rules or ongoing investigations, before they can discuss them.

This Attorney General is not going to be pushed around by anybody in Congress. I would be concerned if she allowed herself to be pushed around. We have had discussions about internal debates that have taken place within the Department of Justice and the FBI on whether in this or that or in another instance an independent counsel should be appointed. I would certainly hope there would be an internal debate. These are very, very serious matters. If we had a Department of Justice or an FBI where internally, on every single issue, everybody walked in lockstep, my question would be what have they missed?

I never remember prosecuting a case of any seriousness or complexity when I was a prosecutor, but with the police or the investigators or other members of my office having some internal debate. "Are we bringing the right charge? Are we bringing enough charges? Are we bringing too strong a charge? Should we withhold charges?" And nothing I ever had to deal with began to reach the significance of what the Attorney General is dealing with.

So will there be internal debate? Of course there will be. Should there be internal debate? Of course there should be. But under the law, at some point the buck stops on her desk, and she has to make that decision. Once she has

made that decision, fine. If we disagree, let us say so. But understand that she has to make it.

Prosecutors have enormous power. The trust and the confidence of the American people in our justice system would evaporate if this Attorney General or any Attorney General allowed politics to dictate decisions like these. I don't think she is doing that. I believe, this is confirmed by listening to even some in the Department of Justice who have disagreed with her decisions. They have all said, unanimously, that they understand she is looking at this very, very honestly. She has made her decisions very directly and very honestly.

People from both the FBI and within the Department of Justice, when asked specifically, "Was anybody put off limits? Was any part of the investigation put off limits?", they said unanimously nothing was put off limits. They were not told to put anybody or any transaction or any activity off limits.

So I think we will see more on this as days go on. I think the meeting this morning was a valuable one and I commend my friend from Utah for having the meeting. Many aspects of this we agree on. Some aspects we may disagree on. But I state to my friend from Utah he has been fair and open with us on this. If we have disagreements, they are honest disagreements. But he and I will continue to work closely on this because in the end what we want to see, whatever these questions are, is that we have them resolved fairly. And I think we agree on that. I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if I can take just another minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, you know, by some counts—some can count as many as nine requests for preliminary reviews in this matter. We are now almost 2 to 3 years down the line. The evidence is growing cold. The witnesses are absenting the country. We have evidence that cannot be found. And we had investigators telling us today that while one part of the Justice Department is going this way, another part of the Department is going another way, they weren't meeting, and that they were not able to put these threads of evidence together because of the type of restrictions and limitations that were placed on them.

It is true that they said that they could investigate anybody, but thus far it seems as though the White House and the DNC leadership, the people who would have known who committed crimes were off limits or at least have not been fully examined. That is one reason why Mr. LaBella, Mr. Freeh, and Mr. Desarno—top people in this Government—have suggested that we should have an independent counsel.

I think the Attorney General has to make a decision here one way or the other. If she makes a decision to just have a limited, narrowly appointed

independent counsel or counsels under these circumstances, then I have to say that is going to be a catastrophic event.

I am hopeful that she will do the right thing within a very limited period of time. She does not have to use the 90 days that she has requested. She has had years now to make determinations in these matters, and she ought to make them, and she ought to make them one way or the other—to her praise or condemnation. I personally believe that she will, within a short period of time. I pray with all my heart that she will, because I like her personally, and I don't feel good about standing up and disagreeing with her. I would like to have a good relationship with her and would naturally like her to be a great Attorney General. But she has to face these problems and she has to face that statute and she can no longer ignore it. Even if she does not agree with the mandatory part of that statute, which appears to be the case, although she is willing to relook at it, she has to agree that there is a whopping conflict of interest here, both an actual conflict and an appearance of a conflict, which necessitates the requests for the appointment of a broad-based independent counsel in these matters to get this finally behind us. And I hope that we can do that.

I apologize to my colleague from Kentucky for interrupting this debate, but this is important to do. I apologize to him at this time and I yield the floor.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-6509. A communication from the Senior Attorney of the Copyright Office, Library of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Copyright Office's report under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1997; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-6510. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, notification that the Department is allotting emergency funds made available under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 to eleven States; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-6511. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Secretary's report on Head Start programs for fiscal years 1994 through 1997; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-6512. A communication from the Director of the Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pediculide Drug Products for Over-the-Counter Human Use; Final Monograph; Technical Amendment" (RIN0910-AA01) received on August 18, 1998; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-6513. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant

to law, the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management's report on activities and expenditures for fiscal year 1997; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-6514. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Tuna Fisheries; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna" (I.D. 070698D) received on August 18, 1998; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6515. A communication from the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Papayas Grown in Hawaii; Increased Assessment Rate" (Docket FV98-928-1 FR) received on August 17, 1998; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6516. A communication from the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Increase in Desirable Carryout Used to Compute Trade Demand" (Docket FV98-989-2 FR) received on August 17, 1998; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6517. A communication from the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Exemption from Area No. 2 Handling Regulation for Potatoes Shipped for Experimentation and the Manufacture or Conversion into Specified Products" (Docket FV98-948-2 IFR) received on August 17, 1998; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6518. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; Florida" (Docket 98-014-2) received on August 17, 1998; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6519. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Mediterranean Fruit Fly; Removal of Quarantine Area" (Docket 97-056-15) received on August 17, 1998; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6520. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Mediterranean Fruit Fly; Addition to Quarantined Areas" (Docket 98-083-1) received on August 17, 1998; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6521. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Mexican Fruit Fly Regulations; Removal of Regulated Area" (Docket 98-084-1) received on August 17, 1998; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6522. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Validated Brucellosis-Free States; Alabama" (Docket 98-086-1) received on August 17, 1998; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.